



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

work, "it is far short of a standard history." It deals with two wars only. The chapter on colonial privateers is given up for the most part to accounts of pirates like Kidd. If the author had turned his eyes toward Narragansett Bay he would have learned that some of the men who took part in the "affair of the Gaspee" (which he describes) had sailed upon colonial privateers. The Wanton family of Newport, which gave four governors to the colony, were famous privateersmen. Private armed vessels from the Bay participated in all the wars in which the colonists were involved by reason of their English allegiance. No less than forty vessels of which the names, and the names of their owners and masters, are preserved sailed out from Newport to fight in the War of the Austrian Succession. In the Seven Years' War no less than fifty-seven privateers were fitted out in Rhode Island. Their names can easily be ascertained. In 1759, according to Arnold's *History*, one-fifth of the adult males were on private armed ships. If so much has escaped notice in the case of one colony what may we not conjecture concerning the others? Mr. Maclay moreover is not always correct in his statements. To illustrate: On page 69 he credits Rhode Island with six vessels,—eight pages later gives the names of seven. If he had examined the Bristol records a little more closely (Part II., Chapter IV.) he would have learned that Bristol alone sent out six, possibly nine, vessels besides the famous *Yankee*—a number much larger than that he assigns to the whole state of Rhode Island. He would moreover have escaped some errors of statement concerning the *Yankee* herself. Singularly enough, in his summing up on page 506, he does not credit Rhode Island with sending out any vessels at all in the War of 1812. But the crying evil of the volume is the careful suppression of almost all mention of the sources whence the information was derived. The reader is frequently referred to Maclay's *History of the United States Navy*, but aside from that there are hardly a dozen references to authorities in the whole work.

WILFRED H. MUNRO.

History of the Civil War, 1861-1865. Being Vol. VI. of *History of the United States of America under the Constitution*. By JAMES SCHOULER. (New York: Dodd, Mead and Co. 1899. Pp. xxii, 647.)

MR. SCHOULER is to be congratulated on the completion of this supplementary volume, which rounds out his work to the utmost limit that he ever contemplated as possible. A history must stop somewhere, and few will deny that for a work like Mr. Schouler's the end of the war is on the whole a more satisfactory stopping-place than the beginning. More than this, the present volume embodies a singularly well-proportioned narrative of the four eventful years of which it treats. This fact alone is a sufficient cause for its existence, and must assure to the author the favorable judgment of the reading public. For we are in the full tide of revelation as to the inner facts of war-history: official records,

memoirs, diaries—all forms of material are flooding the field, and it requires a clear head and a sound judgment to see and keep to the way, and avoid being swamped. A history of the war in one volume that is neither a bare sketch nor a hopeless jumble, is a genuine achievement.

Assuming, then, that Mr. Schouler has not been permitted, by the scope of his work, to contribute largely to the mere facts of the period, nor to offer elaborate discussions of doubtful or controverted matters, the character of his narrative can best be indicated by reference to his point of view in respect to the familiar features of the history which he presents.

First, as to the nature of the secession movement. Mr. Schouler's general position is that the secession was the result of a "conspiracy" of leading Southern politicians, which had for its ultimate purpose the construction of a government in which "slavery should forever dominate." This is a view which had great vogue in the North in 1861, and is still maintained occasionally by persons who have not given careful study to the period. Mr. Schouler shades down the statement of this position so as to reveal the modifying influence of time on his thought. The conspiracy becomes with him "something of a conspiracy"; and the blood-curdling propaganda of the "Knights of the Golden Circle," which loomed so large and definite in the exciting days of secession, is dismissed with a reminiscent allusion, to the effect that the part played by the order in the disunion movement is not known (p. 52). In pointing out that state secession was a mere legalist expedient for the accomplishment of sectional secession, Mr. Schouler is on firm ground. But it is at least a generation too late to talk of the purpose of the slave-owners to "dominate." That this, rather than self-preservation, was their leading hope, is a view that belongs in the same category with that other, expressed in Mr. Schouler's preceding volume, that John Brown, after murdering in cold blood several unoffending inhabitants of Harper's Ferry, was "not a felon."

The author's general tendency to be severe with the secessionists leads him to a position in respect to the Confederate constitution that is rather surprising in a trained lawyer. He censures the Southerners for not putting in their constitution stronger expressions of state sovereignty, instead of tamely appropriating the Constitution of the United States.

"Now, unquestionably, was the occasion to have declared in express terms the pet dogma of secession, of the right of sovereign states to nullify, at the least, any act of Congress; but no assertion of the kind is hinted at. Nothing whatever did state sovereignty gain in this new instrument . . . but a bald avowal in the preamble that each state . . . acted in a sovereign and independent capacity" (p. 55).

But Mr. Schouler must see that it would have been self-stultification for the Southerners to change the wording of the Constitution when they had so long contended that their views embodied the only rational interpretation of the words as they stood. The declaration in the preamble was all that they needed, if they needed anything at all, to render abso-

lutely complete their reasoning. The author is clearly at sea in the passage quoted; and conspicuously so in the opening sentence, which, if it means anything, identifies nullification with secession—a confusion which the logic of Calhoun so incisively repudiated.

Mr. Schouler's estimate of the prominent personalities involved in the struggle illustrates again the conventional type of his thinking. Lincoln is a hero unqualified, with whose eulogy the volume begins and ends. Jefferson Davis is a gloomy despot. McClellan is little above an imbecile. Lee is a good man, handicapped by the "fatal error" of going with his state. Grant is the paramount military hero, whose failure to destroy Lee in 1864 is rather skilfully glossed over. What one misses in the author's judgment is the note of qualification that marks the unbiased historical temper. It is not at all essential to Lincoln's claims to pre-eminent statesmanship, that he should be represented as a civil-service reformer. Nor, in view of the anxious inquiries which preceded the appointment of Grant to the command-in-chief and of Chase to the chief-justiceship, can it be truthfully maintained that Lincoln was not concerned, as his re-election approached, to "shut out rivals from the suffrage of the people" (p. 628). Again, in dealing with McClellan it would be no more than just to note that his persistent overestimate of the forces opposed to him rested, not on the original and inherent perversity of the general's intelligence, but on the unvarying reports of the secret-service department of the army. And it ought to be remembered, also, in any comparison of McClellan with other generals, that he alone has been afflicted with the publication of his letters to his wife. A study in comparative uxoriousness might, if properly documented, shake other reputations as well as his. And finally, it was hardly worth Mr. Schouler's while to emphasize his depreciation of McClellan by lamenting even in a note (p. 242), that the general "was never to be seen charging or directing gloriously in battle, but kept at some secluded occupation." One hardly expects to find in a serious historical work published in 1899 that conception of an army commander which is expressed in the ancient three-color prints of a foaming "charger" standing on his hind legs while the epauletted rider personally decapitates the chief of the opposing host.

Mr. Schouler's narrative of military and political operations is as a whole well-balanced and as full as could be expected in the space. Some statements appear, however, which are clearly and surprisingly erroneous. On page 190 the *Monitor* is endowed with "nimbleness of motion"—a quality which her officers never discovered. The blowing-up of the *Merrimac* is said in a note to have been "a Union exploit"; though in fact it was performed by Commodore Tatnall and his Confederate crew. "The British House of Commons" did not, as Mr. Schouler says, "make remonstrance" against Butler's woman order in New Orleans, though individual members were fierce enough in denunciation. It would appear from the account on page 426 of the detention of the Rebel rams by the British government, that they were stopped as a result of Minister Adams's threat of war. But in fact, as Mr. Rhodes clearly shows

in his last volume, Earl Russell ordered the detention of the vessels before he received Adams's famous despatch. Throughout the discussion of our relations with Great Britain Mr. Schouler's view of Earl Russell is widely at variance with that of Mr. Rhodes, representing the English statesman as a rather hateful exponent of the extreme pro-Confederate feeling, though in fact he seems to have been disposed to do full justice to both sides. Vallandigham was buried in the gubernatorial election in Ohio in 1863 not, as Mr. Schouler says, under "one hundred thousand adverse votes," but under a hundred thousand adverse majority. Finally, Early's force in the Valley in 1864, so far from being "about the same" as Sheridan's (p. 517), was in fact less than half as large, or about 15,000 to 40,000 (cf. *Battles and Leaders*, IV. 524, note). In view of this disparity the result of the campaign can not be ascribed off-hand to "the superior fighting capacity of Sheridan."

In Mr. Schouler's narrative of the non-military history of the times the government's policy and practice of arbitrary arrests receives very inadequate treatment. The subject is indeed dismissed with a half-dozen bare allusions, except for the *cause célèbre* of Vallandigham. This is certainly a grave distortion of history; for, with the exception of emancipation, no feature of administration policy in non-military affairs had so important an influence on public opinion as that touching civil rights in the loyal states. The failure to give due prominence to the facts of this matter is the most serious defect in the plan and execution of Mr. Schouler's volume.

WILLIAM A. DUNNING.

Charles Francis Adams. By his son, CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS. [American Statesmen Series.] (Boston and New York: Houghton, Mifflin and Co. 1900. Pp. vii, 426.)

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS stepped out into national politics in 1848, a few months after the death of John Quincy Adams. Those who had never admired the moral combativeness of the father now pretended to have great respect for his memory, and referred to him as "the last of the Adamases," so as to ridicule the son, who was the Free-Soil candidate for the vice-presidency on the ticket with Martin Van Buren. Not until about fourteen years later did it become certain that this third Adams in direct line was to make a brilliant public record. The fact was recognized during and after the war period, but this biography is the first attempt to describe the Adams whose chief fame was won in the field of diplomacy.

In this family, independence seems to be a trait, which is stronger in the fourth than in any previous generation. The present biographer soon wins the reader's confidence by the impartiality with which he sides at one time with John Quincy Adams and at another with Charles Francis Adams. The lives of the two men, between 1830 and 1846, were inseparably interwoven with each other, and the memorable record made